



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

BARNES & THORNBURG, LLP  
P.O. BOX 2786  
CHICAGO, IL 60690-2786

**COPY MAILED**

**FEB 03 2006**

**OFFICE OF PETITIONS**

In re Application of  
Tierney, et al.  
Application No. 10/039,570  
Filed: October 26, 2001  
Attorney Docket No. 27734/92540

ON PETITION

This is a decision on the petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a), or in the alternative 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed November 23, 2005, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition under 37 CFR 1.137(a) is **dismissed**.

This application became abandoned for failure to timely reply to the non-final Office action mailed February 24, 2003. Accordingly, this application became abandoned on May 25, 2003. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on November 26, 2003.

A grantable petition to revive an abandoned application under 37 CFR 1.137(a) must be accompanied by:

- (1) The required reply, unless previously filed. In a nonprovisional application abandoned for failure to prosecute, the required reply may be met by the filing of a continuing application. In an application or patent, abandoned or lapsed for failure to pay the issue fee or any portion thereof, the required reply must be the payment of the issue fee or any outstanding balance thereof;
- (2) The petition fee as set forth in § 1.17(l);
- (3) A showing to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to this paragraph was unavoidable; and
- (4) Any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in § 1.20 (d)) required pursuant to paragraph (c) of this section.

This petition lacks item (3) above.

Decisions on reviving abandoned applications on the basis of “unavoidable” delay have adopted the reasonably prudent person standard in determining if the delay was unavoidable:

The word ‘unavoidable’ . . . is applicable to ordinary human affairs, and requires no more or greater care or diligence than is generally used and observed by prudent and careful men in relation to their most important business. It permits them in the exercise of this care to rely upon the ordinary and trustworthy agencies of mail and telegraph, worthy and reliable employees, and such other means and instrumentalities as are usually employed in such important business. If unexpectedly, or through the unforeseen fault or imperfection of these agencies and instrumentalities, there occurs a failure, it may properly be said to be unavoidable, all other conditions of promptness in its rectification being present.

In re Mattullath, 38 App. D.C. 497, 514-15 (1912)(quoting Ex parte Pratt, 1887 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 31, 32-33 (1887)); see also Winkler v. Ladd, 221 F. Supp. 550, 552, 138 USPQ 666, 167-68 (D.D.C. 1963), aff’d, 143 USPQ 172 (D.C. Cir. 1963); Ex parte Henrich, 1913 Dec. Comm’r Pat. 139, 141 (1913). In addition, decisions on revival are made on a “case-by-case basis, taking all the facts and circumstances into account.” Smith v. Mossinghoff, 671 F.2d 533, 538, 213 USPQ 977, 982 (D.C. Cir. 1982). Finally, a petition cannot be granted where a petitioner has failed to meet his or her burden of establishing that the delay was “unavoidable.” Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 316-17, 5 USPQ2d 1130, 1131-32 (N.D. Ind. 1987).

Petitioner asserts financial difficulty as a cause of delay. Petitioner has not explained how financial difficulty caused the unavoidable delay. Additionally, a showing of “unavoidable” delay based upon financial difficulty must be supported by a complete showing of the responsible person’s or entity’s financial condition during the relevant period, including income, expenses, assets, credit and obligations, which made the delay unavoidable. Such documentary evidence of financial difficulty has not been submitted.

Furthermore, petitioner states various crimes and fraudulent activities have been committed against the applicant. However, no police reports or other documentary evidence has been submitted in support.

Additionally, the record indicates that the law firm of Barnes & Thornburg, LLP was responsible for prosecution of the above-identified application when the reply necessary to avoid abandonment was due. Therefore, petitioner must provide a statement from the law firm of Barnes & Thornburg, LLP explaining why action was not timely taken to prevent the above-identified application from becoming abandoned. Such a statement has not been submitted.

Lastly, please note, the Patent and Trademark Office must rely on the actions or inactions of duly authorized and voluntarily chosen representatives of the applicant, and petitioner is bound by the consequences of those actions or inactions. Link v. Wabash, 370 U.S. 626, 633-34 (1962); Huston v. Ladner, 973 F.2d 1564, 1567, 23 U.S.P.Q.2d 1910, 1913 (Fed. Cir. 1992); see also Haines v. Quigg, 673 F. Supp. 314, 317, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1130, 1132 (D.N. Ind. 1987). Further, please note, the Patent and Trademark Office is not the proper forum for resolving disputes

between applicants and their representatives. See Ray v. Lehman, 55 F.3d 606, 34 USPQ2d 1786 (Fed. Cir. 1995).

Accordingly, the showing of record is not sufficient to establish to the satisfaction of the Commissioner that the delay was unavoidable within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 133 and 37 CFR 1.137(a).

However, the petitioner has requested that, in the alternative, that the petition be considered under 37 CFR 1.137(b).

The petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) is **granted**.

The statement of unintentional delay presented in the petition does not comply with the current rule. Effective December 1, 1997, 37 CFR 1.137(b)(3) requires a statement that "the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional" be submitted. However, the statement presented will be accepted and construed as meaning that "the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional." If this is an incorrect interpretation in view of the rules, petitioner is required to provide a statement to that effect.

The above-identified application has been abandoned for an extended period of time. The Patent and Trademark Office is relying on petitioner's duty of candor and good faith and accepting the statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure, 62 Fed. Reg. At 53160 and 53178, 1203 Off. Gaz Pat. Office at 88 and 103 (responses to comments 64 and 109)(applicant obligated under 37 CFR 10.18 to inquire into the underlying facts and circumstances when providing the statement required by 37 CFR 1.137(b) to the Patent and Trademark Office).

It is not apparent whether the statement of unintentional delay was signed by a person who would have been in a position of knowing that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional. Nevertheless, in accordance with 37 CFR 10.18, the statement is accepted as constituting a certification of unintentional delay. However, in the event that petitioner has no knowledge that the delay was unintentional, petitioner must make such an inquiry to ascertain that, in fact, the delay was unintentional. If petitioner discovers that the delay was intentional, petitioner must so notify the Office.

The additional \$500.00 for a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) has been charged to deposit account no. 50-2063, as per the authorized found in the instant petition.

Please note, the "Revocation of Power of Attorney with New Power of Attorney and Change of Correspondence Address" has **NOT** been entered. As the document was signed by the assignee, a statement under 37 CFR 3.73(b) **MUST** be submitted.

A courtesy copy of this decision is being mailed to the address noted on the petition. However, until otherwise instructed, all future correspondence regarding this application will be mailed solely to the address of record.

The file is being forwarded to Technology Center 3600 for review of the amendment filed November 23, 2005, *in due course*.

Telephone inquiries should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3228.

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'Ed T', followed by a long horizontal line.

Edward J. Tannouse  
Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions  
Office of the Deputy Commissioner  
for Patent Examination Policy

cc.

MERONI & MERONI  
P.O. BOX 309  
BARRINGTON, IL 60011